USCA4 Appeal: 23-1850 Doc: 17 Filed: 09/08/2023 Pg: 1 of 7

No. 23-1850

In the

United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit

HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC.; HAND HELD PRODUCTS, INC.; METROLOGIC INSTRUMENTS, INC.,

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

v.

OPTO ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,

Defendant-Appellee.

On Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina Case No. 3:21-cv-506-KDB-DCK

UNOPPOSED MOTION TO HOLD APPEAL IN ABEYANCE PENDING RESOLUTION OF POST-TRIAL MOTION

Brian D. Schmalzbach
McGuireWoods LLP
Gateway Plaza
800 East Canal Street
Richmond, VA 23219
bschmalzbach@mcguirewoods.com

Counsel for OPTO Electronics Co., Ltd.

USCA4 Appeal: 23-1850 Doc: 17 Filed: 09/08/2023 Pg: 2 of 7

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

- In civil, agency, bankruptcy, and mandamus cases, a disclosure statement must be filed by **all** parties, with the following exceptions: (1) the United States is not required to file a disclosure statement; (2) an indigent party is not required to file a disclosure statement; and (3) a state or local government is not required to file a disclosure statement in pro se cases. (All parties to the action in the district court are considered parties to a mandamus case.)
- In criminal and post-conviction cases, a corporate defendant must file a disclosure statement.
- In criminal cases, the United States must file a disclosure statement if there was an organizational victim of the alleged criminal activity. (See question 7.)
- Any corporate amicus curiae must file a disclosure statement.
- Counsel has a continuing duty to update the disclosure statement.

No.	No. 23-1850 Caption: Honeywell International Inc., et al. v. OPTO Electronics Co., Ltd.				
Pursuant to FRAP 26.1 and Local Rule 26.1, OPTO Electronics Co., Ltd.					
	o is, makes the following disclosure: rellant/appellee/petitioner/respondent/amicus/intervenor)				
1.	Is party/amicus a publicly held corporation or other publicly held entity? YES NO				
2.	Does party/amicus have any parent corporations? ☐ YES ✓ NO If yes, identify all parent corporations, including all generations of parent corporations:				
3.	Is 10% or more of the stock of a party/amicus owned by a publicly held corporation or other publicly held entity? ☐ YES ✓ NO If yes, identify all such owners:				

12/01/2019 SCC - 1 -

Couns	el for: OPTO Electronics Co., Ltd.		
Signat	_{ure:} /s/ Brian D. Schmalzbach	Date:	9/8/2023
7.	Is this a criminal case in which there was an organizational If yes, the United States, absent good cause shown, must li victim of the criminal activity and (2) if an organizational parent corporation and any publicly held corporation that of victim, to the extent that information can be obtained that	st (1) each or victim is a cor owns 10% or 1	rporation, the more of the stock
6.	Does this case arise out of a bankruptcy proceeding? If yes, the debtor, the trustee, or the appellant (if neither the party) must list (1) the members of any creditors' committee caption), and (3) if a debtor is a corporation, the parent corporation that owns 10% or more of the stock of the debt	ee, (2) each deporation and	ebtor (if not in the
5.	Is party a trade association? (amici curiae do not complete If yes, identify any publicly held member whose stock or e substantially by the outcome of the proceeding or whose cl pursuing in a representative capacity, or state that there is not a state of the proceeding or whose classical pursuing in a representative capacity, or state that there is not a state of the proceeding or whose classical pursuing in a representative capacity.	quity value co	ould be affected e association is
4.	Is there any other publicly held corporation or other public financial interest in the outcome of the litigation? If yes, identify entity and nature of interest:	ly held entity	that has a direct ☐YES ✓NO

Defendant OPTO Electronics Co., Ltd. ("OPTO") respectfully requests that the Court hold this appeal in abeyance until the District Court resolves OPTO's pending post-trial motion, with the parties to provide a status update after the resolution of that post-trial motion. *See* Fourth Circuit R. 12(d). Plaintiffs-Appellants are unopposed to the relief sought in this motion.

Following a jury trial, the District Court entered judgment on July 20, 2023. Plaintiffs-Appellants filed a notice of appeal from that judgment on August 14, 2023. On August 17, 2023, OPTO timely filed a motion for judgment as a matter of law under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 50 and, in the alternative, for a new trial under Rule 59. That post-trial motion has not yet been fully briefed and remains pending.

Plaintiffs-Appellants' notice of appeal thus "becomes effective . . . when the order disposing of the last such remaining [post-trial] motion is entered." Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(4)(B)(i). Depending on the resolution of OPTO's pending post-trial motion, OPTO may also file its own notice of appeal, for which the time to file "runs . . . from the entry of the order disposing of the last such remaining [post-trial] motion." Fed. R. App. P 4(a)(4)(A). Thus, it would be premature to litigate this appeal, and there is

USCA4 Appeal: 23-1850 Doc: 17 Filed: 09/08/2023 Pg: 5 of 7

good cause to hold it in abeyance under Fourth Circuit Rule 12(d) until the post-trial motion is resolved.

Dated: September 8, 2023 Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Brian D. Schmalzbach

Brian D. Schmalzbach McGuireWoods LLP Gateway Plaza 800 East Canal Street Richmond, VA 23219 (804) 775-4746 bschmalzbach@mcguirewoods.com

Counsel for OPTO Electronics Co., Ltd.

USCA4 Appeal: 23-1850 Doc: 17 Filed: 09/08/2023 Pg: 6 of 7

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

1. This brief complies with the type-volume limitations of Fed. R.

App. P. 27(d)(2)(A) because it contains 232 words, excluding the parts of the

brief exempted by Fed. R. App. P. 32(f).

2. This brief complies with the typeface and type-style

requirements of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(5) and Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(6) because

it has been prepared in a proportionally spaced, 14-point Book Antiqua font

using Microsoft Word.

/s/ Brian D. Schmalzbach

Brian D. Schmalzbach

USCA4 Appeal: 23-1850 Doc: 17 Filed: 09/08/2023 Pg: 7 of 7

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on September 8, 2023, the foregoing was filed with the Clerk of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit using the appellate CM/ECF system, which will also serve counsel of record.

/s/ Brian D. Schmalzbach
Brian D. Schmalzbach